

REMARKS:

Claims 1-20 are in the case and presented for consideration.

Claim 1 has been amended to better explain and further distinguish the invention over the cited prior art.

Support for the above amendments can be found throughout the originally filed disclosure. Specifically, in the originally filed specification, the amendments to claim 1 find support: at page 5, line 10-16 and page 9 line 2-6 (for the converter being a low-level and a high-level setter for adjusting the DC voltage output); in Figs. 4, 5, 7, 8 and page 5, line 11 (for the adjustable DC voltage output of the converter being provided to the bridge circuit); and in Figs. 4, 5, 7, 8 and page 5, line 17-23 and page 6, line 4-7 and 18 (for the direct connection between the secondary winding of the transformer 14 and the electrodes 3 being truly "direct" by having no electronic component which would influence pulse or amplitude at the secondary winding).

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

In accordance with Examiner's comments, the references discussed in the specification have been listed in the appropriate form, that is PTO/SB/08A and PTO/SB/08b, which are submitted with this amendment with an IDS.

Additionally, a copy of the non-patent reference listed in the PTO/SB/08b form is also submitted with this amendment.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,993,613 to Manley ("Manley") in view of US Patent 5,026,471 to Latz et al ("Latz").

Applicants respectfully traverse the Office's rejections that the claims of the subject application are obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Both Manley and Latz fail to disclose or suggest the critical element claimed in previous claim 1 and even further highlighted in currently amended claim 1, namely the **direct** connected between the secondary transformer coil winding (26, 26') and the electrodes (3).

Neither reference teaches or suggests the features of claim 1:

the transformer (14) having at least one primary winding connected to the bridge circuit and at least one secondary winding having two connections, the two connections of the secondary winding being respectively and directly connected to the two outputs (26, 26') which are respectively and directly connected to the two electrodes so that a bipolar voltage at the secondary winding of the transformer is transferred to the electrodes so that the electrodes operated with alternating polarity(emphasis added)

nor:

wherein the direct connection between the secondary winding of the transformer (14) and the electrodes (3) includes no electronic component which would influence pulse or

amplitude at the secondary winding.

The Examiner has not indicated in the Office Action where the language of former claim 1, "the two connections of the secondary winding being respectively and directly connected to the two electrodes" can be found. The additional language of amended claim 1 is utilized to better define this direct connection.

Manley employs major electronic components between the secondary coil 101 of its transformer 100 in its Fig. 6 and the electrodes (anode 18 and cathode 20) in its Fig. 1, and there is no transformer in Latz. In fact, for both references, the arrangements require indirect connection to the electrodes. If the components connected to the electrodes in Latz and between the secondary 101 and the electrodes in Manley were removed, neither Manley nor Latz would be operative, nor would the combination of these references suggested by the Examiner operate. It is not seen how an inoperative combination would render the claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

By contrast, in the presently claimed invention, there are no electronic components of any kind (due to the direct connection) and even more specifically no electronic components that would influence pulse or amplitude at the secondary winding, between the secondary transformer coil and the electrodes.

Furthermore, neither of the cited references provides a teaching which could be used by one of ordinary skill in the art to come up with the claimed combination without a major rearrangement of the parts and functions in both references.

Therefore, because Manley and Latz both fail to disclose or suggest at least one critical element claimed in currently amended independent claim 1, from which all other claims depend, and because they also fail to provide a teaching which could be used by one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the presently claimed invention, the combination of Manley and Latz does not render any of the claims obvious.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

One of the attorneys of record on this application plans on calling the Examiner shortly after filing this amendment in order to discuss the application and the important differences that are believed to be clearly defined in the claims and not rendered obvious by the prior art, in an effort to reach a conclusion to the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,
/SALVATORE P SPEZIO/
Salvatore P. Spezio
Reg. No. 60,868
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: March 23, 2009

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706

R:\PATAMD\J423-019\J423-019US-Amendment.wpd